

No. 5937 號七十三百九千五第 日九十月十年子丙緒光 HONGKONG, MONDAY, DECEMBER 4TH, 1876. 一拜禮 號四月三十英 港香 [PRICE \$2 PER MONTH]

| Arrivals. | To be let. | Notices of Firms. | Auctions. | Auctions. | Intimations. | Intimations. |
|-----------|------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|--------------|
|-----------|------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|--------------|

Information.

THE STEAMSHIP
 "YESSO,"
 Captain S. Ashton, will be despatched for the
 above Ports TO-DAY, the 4th inst., at 5 P.M.,
 and will return to the above Port on the 11th inst.
 For Freight or Passage, apply to
 DOUGLAS LARPAKE & Co.
 1927 Hongkong, 2nd December, 1876.
 FOR AMOY.
 THE STEAMSHIP
 "ESMERALDA,"
 Captain Thibaud, will have immediate dispatch
 for the above Port.
 For Freight or Passage, apply to
 A. M. S. BEATON
 Agent.
 1934 Hongkong, 4th December, 1876.
 FOR HAMBURG.
 THE AD Danish Bark

Have quick despatch.

VOGEL, HAGEDORN & Co.
1030 Hongkong, 4th December, 1876.

VICTORIA REGATTA, 1876.

ENTRIES FOR RACES in the above REGATTA
never be made by any one of the under-
mentioned Gentlemen:

J. P. McGUIRE, Esq., R.N.
W. HINES, Esq.
E. EMAGE, Esq.
H. E. WODEHOUSE, Esq.
H. E. WODEHOUSE,
Hon. Sec., Victoria Recreation Club.
1931 Hongkong, 4th December, 1876.

COOLING'S PATENT TYPHOON AND
THE UNDERGROUND

THE Undergroun are now prepared to apply
the above to Windows and Venetians.

Apply to
O. E. COOLINGS, No. 20, Praya Central,
Messrs. WILSON & SALWAY Architects,
R. G. ALFORD Esq. Surveyor.

NOTICE.

R. WM. O. BOWLAND is authorized to
SIGN our FIRM'S NAME per procuratione.

— WILLIAMS & Co.
8m 1933 Swatow, December 1st, 1876

HONGKONG, HARTUNG, THURAT

EXHIBITION SOCIETY

H. MAGNAN, Esq., President.
W. M. B. ARTHUR, Esq., Rev. J. J. MONT.
J. B. COQUETTE, Esq., A. G. ROMANO, Esq.,
H. DUCK, Esq., Ed. STABLE, Esq.,
F. FORB, Esq., A. E. VAUGHAN, Esq.,
H. J. HOLMES, Esq.,
J. FAIRBAIRN, Esq., Honorary Treasurer.
O. S. TAYLOR, Esq., Honorary Secretary.

THE ANNUAL FLOWER AND VEGETABLE SHOW will be held on FRIDAY and SATURDAY, the 16th and 17th February, 1897.
1924 Hongkong, 22nd December, 1896.

NOTICE.
MR. J. PENATI, PROFESSOR OF MUSIC, from the Royal Conservatorium of Music, now residing in Monaco, visits Hongkong THREE DAYS A WEEK, viz. Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, and gives LESSONS on the PIANO and SINGING. Letters can be addressed, care of Messrs. LANE, CRAWFORD & CO. [143] 1909.

A CARD.
P. F. DA SILVA,
GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT,
TAKAO and TAIWANPOO.
5th 1856 Takao, November, 1874.

G. O. ROGERS, DENTAL SURGEON,
No. 7, ABBUTHNOT ROAD,
BAR RETURNED, and now ready to receive
Patients.
227 Hongkong, 16th November, 1876.

Notices to Dismisses

JEAN STEAMSHIP

CONSIGNEES per Company's Steamer
Dentition are hereby notified that the Cargo is being discharged into craft, and landed at the Company's wharf, and undersigned, in both cases it will be at Consignees' risk. The Cargo will be ready for delivery from Craft or Godown on and after the 1st December, 1876.

Cargo remaining in the Undersigned's warehouse, will be subject to Rent, after the 5th December, 1876, will be subject to Rent.

RUTTERFELD & SWIRE, Agents.
1925 Hongkong, 20th November, 1876.

**STEAMSHIP IRACUNDY,
COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES
MARITIMES.**

NOTICE.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo per Steamship *GANGE*, from London, in connection with the above Steamer, are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed and stored at their risks at the Company's Godowns, whence delivery may be obtained immediately after landing. Bills of Lading will be forwarded unless intimation is received from the Consignees before 3 P.M. TO-DAY, requesting it, to be landed at once.

Bills of Lading will be countersigned by the Undersigned.

Goods remaining unclaimed after FRIDAY, the 2nd December, at Noon, will be subject to rent and landing charges.

No Fire Insurance has been effected.

H. DU POUEY,
Agent.
1916 Hongkong, 20th November, 1876.

**GERMAN STEAMSHIP GALATHEE,
BOHRMANN, MASTER FROM HAMBURG,
via SINGAPORE.**

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above Steamer are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed and stored at their risks in the Godown of the Undersigned, from whence delivery may be obtained.

Consignees wishing to take the delivery of their Goods must do so alongside the wharf and at liberty to do so.

Goods remaining in store after the 5th December will be subject to rent.

Cargo remaining in the Undersigned's warehouse to-day, will be forwarded unless intimation to the contrary is given before 3 o'clock P.M. TO-DAY, the 29th instant.

Bills of Lading will be countersigned by the Undersigned.

J. C. FRYER & Co.,
Agents.
1902 Hongkong, 29th November, 1876.

**SMITHS SHIP FIRE QUEEN, FROM
LONDON.**

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above-named Steamer are hereby requested to send in their Bill of Lading to the Undersigned for Counter-signature, and to take immediate delivery of their Goods.

Cargo impeding the discharge of the Vessel will be landed and stored at Consignees' risk and expense.

ARNOLD, KARBURG & Co.,
Agents.
1860 Hongkong, 25th November, 1876.

THE CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY
FOR 1877.
(With which has been incorporated the
CHINA DIRECTORY.)

The Publisher requests that those who have not yet returned the printed forms which have been sent to them to fill up, will be good enough to do so without delay. Any persons who have recently arrived, and to whom printed forms have not been sent, are respectfully requested to forward their names and addresses as early as possible for insertion.

Daily Press Office, November 13th, 1876.

NOTICE

A. S. WATSON & CO.
FAMILY AND DISPENSING
CHEMISTS.
By Appointment to His Excellency the Governor and his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh.
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DRUGGISTS,
PERFUMERS,
PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS,
DRUGGISTS' SUPPLIERS.
And
ABRATED WATER MAKERS.
SHIPS' MEDICINE CHESTS REFITTED.
PASSENGER SHIPS SUPPLIED.

NOTICE.—To avoid delay in the execution of Orders it is particularly requested that all business communications be addressed to the Firm, A. S. Watson & Co., or
827 HONGKONG DISPENSARY.

MARRIAGE.
On the 28th December, at St. John's Cathedral, Hongkong, by the Rev. R. Hayward Kidd, Colonial Chaplain, FRANCIS WALDEMAR GEORGE VON STOCKHRAUSEN, of Hongkong, to SARAH MAYNARD, only daughter of the late Lieutenant Colonel R.M.L.L. of Southern Hants.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, DECEMBER 4th, 1876.

The jury have acquitted Mr. DAVID GILLIES of the charge brought against him, and their verdict will be received with general approbation. They had to decide between the variable evidence of four Chinese witnesses on the one hand, and the positive testimony of a number of European witnesses and the dictates of common sense on the other. That there was doubt in the matter is evident to any one on reading the evidence, and it is a cardinal maxim in English law to give the accused the benefit of all doubts. Unless it was clearly proved that the man died from the effects of the push administered by Mr. GILLIES, the jury could not conscientiously bring in a verdict of manslaughter. As the Chief Justice reminded them, in summing up, reason should have supremacy over sentiment in dealing with a case of the kind. Let us see what were the statements before them, and whether they have been guided by reason or sentiment. On the 16th ultimo Mr. MARSHALL's ship, *Narcissus*, which had been undergoing repairs in the Hope Dock, Aberdeen, was being got out. Mr. GILLIES, as Secretary to the Dock Company, was there to see her safely undocked. Everything was proceeding well, but one of the masts, which passed across the ship of land between the two docks, fouled twice in consequence of some mud punts which obstructed it. Commander JEFFERSON, seeing this, called out to Mr. GILLIES, who went to the coxswain and ordered them to pull the punts away. Instead of doing this, they, probably through stupidity, pulled by the wrong barrel and made matters more critical. Mr. GILLIES, naturally excited, ran up, pushed or kicked the front coxswain, telling him to get out of the way, took the havers, threw it over the side, and told them to pull it to him. Now one of the coxswains, who was standing by, saw Mr. GILLIES strike him slightly and kicked the deceased twice when he had fallen, and that the man died on the spot. The others did not see anyone else struck, but agreed that Mr. GILLIES kicked the man twice and that he died there and then. In their evidence, however, there are numerous discrepancies. At the inquest they told one tale; at the Police Court they gave another version of the affair; and in the Supreme Court they contradicted their previous statements in some important points. At each hearing they state a different time for the occurrence, but to this discrepancy little importance can be attached. The assertion that it was nearly dark at the time was disproved by the testimony of several witnesses, who positively swore that it was quite light enough not only to see any man who might be lying on the ground but even to read. Then the witnesses for the prosecution swear that Mr. GILLIES could not be found when they looked for him, but that he himself immediately left in the steam launch. Now it is satisfactorily proved that Mr. GILLIES first went off in a boat to the *Narcissus*, where he stayed until nearly seven o'clock, and then left in the steam launch. There is really a good deal of mystery about the occurrence. As nearly as can be ascertained, the push or kick seems to have been given about a quarter to six o'clock. The Chinese witnesses say the man died almost instantly. If so, why was not somebody informed of it, who, some ten minutes or so later, at six o'clock, the time at which the watchman at the gate was first made acquainted with the fact? The man must, if his story be true, have been lying on the ground for more than an hour without any one but these four men seeing him. This, at all events, was what the jury were asked to believe. A gunner and three other men from the *Narcissus* walked across the ground a few minutes past six o'clock and failed to see any one lying on the ground; and the gunner swore positively that it was impossible for any man to be lying there without his seeing him. Lord CHARLES SCOTT and Commander JEFFERSON gave similar testimony. They were in such a position when the vessel glided out of dock, which was directly after the event, that they could scarcely have missed observing a man lying on the ground. But no one saw him. The most obvious conclusion is that he was not there to be seen. How, then, did he die by his death? Was he, after all, in whom Mr. GILLIES pushed away

with his foot? We have nothing but the evidence of his four fellow coolies and kinsmen to prove it. Or if he was, it is not possible, as argued by the counsel for the defence, that he had another fall subsequently? In any case, there is no doubt that the blow itself did not cause death. The evidence of Mr. AYRES, as at all doubts on that head. That gentleman showed that a rupture of the spleen from a blow would be on one side only, not, as in the case of the deceased, on both sides, which could only be caused by a fall. Of course it is possible that the fall consequent on the push given by Mr. GILLIES might have caused the rupture, but that can scarcely be made to account for the bruises on the body, which are more consistent with the theory that he fell down the dock steps. Under all these circumstances, who will undertake to say that the case was clearly made out against Mr. GILLIES? It is in all of doubt, and the jury must have felt this fact deeply. In any case, had it been proved that the deceased was the man whom Mr. GILLIES pushed, and that he died in consequence of the fall, it could only have been treated as an accident, and a merely nominal punishment awarded to him. But, unfortunately, the jury could not easily reconcile the return of a verdict of manslaughter with the cloud of doubt hanging over the case. It was not right, though it was very natural, for Mr. GILLIES to use violence to the man, but he has more than sufficiently atoned for his indiscretion—an indiscretion into which he fell, out of every ten Britons would have been betrayed under similar circumstances. This verdict returned was, therefore, the only one with the conflicting evidence—that the jury could have returned consistently with a desire to do justice to the accused. It is to be regretted that the Chief Justice should, in summing up, have gone so far as to intimate that if the jury did not convict Mr. GILLIES on the evidence before them he should tremble for the cause of the administration of justice in the Colony. Such words would not have excited surprise coming from an advocate, but they were scarcely to be expected from a judge. Happily, there is good reason to believe that the Chief Justice will tremble without compunction for public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of Hongkong jurors will remain unimpaired by the verdict recorded on Saturday.

The census of the population of the Colony will be taken today.

The British steamer *Conquest* brings intelligence that the *Fort Constant* at Hong Kong reported to have set out on her voyage to Yunnan about the 20th of November.

The Agent of the Pacific Mail Company has received telegrams announcing that the steamer *Albatross*, with mails, &c., from San Francisco, to the last ultimo, sailed from Yokohama for this port on the 1st instant.

At the Peak the maximum temperature during the week ended at Saturday's close was 75.5, the minimum 55.0; at the Harbour-Master's Office, Praya Water, the maximum was 75.5, and the minimum 54.0. 0.47 inch of rain fell during the week.

Mr. D. H. Bailey, the United States Consul, has received a telegram dated London, 28th December, in which it is stated that the late election, that is, "undecided," probably "Hayes." This information comes from a very high authority, and may be confidently relied upon.

By an advertisement in another column, it will be seen that an entertainment will be given at the Theatre Royal, on the 11th inst. The programme is a good one and judiciously varied. The chair will be taken by the Rev. W. H. Baynes, M.A. The proceeds of the entertainment will be devoted to the benefit of the Soldiers' Dancers' Home, Hampstead.

DIAMANTO PERFORMANCE AT THE THEATRE ROYAL.

On Friday night the officers of H.M.S. *Tropae* gave a dramatic performance at the Theatre Royal, City Hall, in aid of the Diamond Jubilee. The play was *The Jew*, and the performance was of the highest quality. The acting was excellent, and the scenery was very fine. The audience was large, and the proceeds were well received. The play was given in aid of the Diamond Jubilee, and the proceeds were used for the benefit of the Soldiers' Dancers' Home, Hampstead.

with his foot? We have nothing but the evidence of his four fellow coolies and kinsmen to prove it. Or if he was, it is not possible, as argued by the counsel for the defence, that he had another fall subsequently? In any case, there is no doubt that the blow itself did not cause death. The evidence of Mr. AYRES, as at all doubts on that head. That gentleman showed that a rupture of the spleen from a blow would be on one side only, not, as in the case of the deceased, on both sides, which could only be caused by a fall. Of course it is possible that the fall consequent on the push given by Mr. GILLIES might have caused the rupture, but that can scarcely be made to account for the bruises on the body, which are more consistent with the theory that he fell down the dock steps. Under all these circumstances, who will undertake to say that the case was clearly made out against Mr. GILLIES? It is in all of doubt, and the jury must have felt this fact deeply. In any case, had it been proved that the deceased was the man whom Mr. GILLIES pushed, and that he died in consequence of the fall, it could only have been treated as an accident, and a merely nominal punishment awarded to him. But, unfortunately, the jury could not easily reconcile the return of a verdict of manslaughter with the cloud of doubt hanging over the case. It was not right, though it was very natural, for Mr. GILLIES to use violence to the man, but he has more than sufficiently atoned for his indiscretion—an indiscretion into which he fell, out of every ten Britons would have been betrayed under similar circumstances. This verdict returned was, therefore, the only one with the conflicting evidence—that the jury could have returned consistently with a desire to do justice to the accused. It is to be regretted that the Chief Justice should, in summing up, have gone so far as to intimate that if the jury did not convict Mr. GILLIES on the evidence before them he should tremble for the cause of the administration of justice in the Colony. Such words would not have excited surprise coming from an advocate, but they were scarcely to be expected from a judge. Happily, there is good reason to believe that the Chief Justice will tremble without compunction for public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of Hongkong jurors will remain unimpaired by the verdict recorded on Saturday.

Daily Press Office, November 13th, 1876.

NOTICE

A. S. WATSON & CO.
FAMILY AND DISPENSING
CHEMISTS.
By Appointment to His Excellency the Governor and his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh.
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DRUGGISTS,
PERFUMERS,
PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS,
DRUGGISTS' SUPPLIERS.
And
ABRATED WATER MAKERS.
SHIPS' MEDICINE CHESTS REFITTED.
PASSENGER SHIPS SUPPLIED.

NOTICE.—To avoid delay in the execution of Orders it is particularly requested that all business communications be addressed to the Firm, A. S. Watson & Co., or
827 HONGKONG DISPENSARY.

MARRIAGE.
On the 28th December, at St. John's Cathedral, Hongkong, by the Rev. R. Hayward Kidd, Colonial Chaplain, FRANCIS WALDEMAR GEORGE VON STOCKHRAUSEN, of Hongkong, to SARAH MAYNARD, only daughter of the late Lieutenant Colonel R.M.L.L. of Southern Hants.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, DECEMBER 4th, 1876.

The jury have acquitted Mr. DAVID GILLIES of the charge brought against him, and their verdict will be received with general approbation. They had to decide between the variable evidence of four Chinese witnesses on the one hand, and the positive testimony of a number of European witnesses and the dictates of common sense on the other. That there was doubt in the matter is evident to any one on reading the evidence, and it is a cardinal maxim in English law to give the accused the benefit of all doubts. Unless it was clearly proved that the man died from the effects of the push administered by Mr. GILLIES, the jury could not conscientiously bring in a verdict of manslaughter. As the Chief Justice reminded them, in summing up, reason should have supremacy over sentiment in dealing with a case of the kind. Let us see what were the statements before them, and whether they have been guided by reason or sentiment. On the 16th ultimo Mr. MARSHALL's ship, *Narcissus*, which had been undergoing repairs in the Hope Dock, Aberdeen, was being got out. Mr. GILLIES, as Secretary to the Dock Company, was there to see her safely undocked. Everything was proceeding well, but one of the masts, which passed across the ship of land between the two docks, fouled twice in consequence of some mud punts which obstructed it. Commander JEFFERSON, seeing this, called out to Mr. GILLIES, who went to the coxswain and ordered them to pull the punts away. Instead of doing this, they, probably through stupidity, pulled by the wrong barrel and made matters more critical. Mr. GILLIES, naturally excited, ran up, pushed or kicked the front coxswain, telling him to get out of the way, took the havers, threw it over the side, and told them to pull it to him. Now one of the coxswains, who was standing by, saw Mr. GILLIES strike him slightly and kicked the deceased twice when he had fallen, and that the man died on the spot. The others did not see anyone else struck, but agreed that Mr. GILLIES kicked the man twice and that he died there and then. In their evidence, however, there are numerous discrepancies. At the inquest they told one tale; at the Police Court they gave another version of the affair; and in the Supreme Court they contradicted their previous statements in some important points. At each hearing they state a different time for the occurrence, but to this discrepancy little importance can be attached. The assertion that it was nearly dark at the time was disproved by the testimony of several witnesses, who positively swore that it was quite light enough not only to see any man who might be lying on the ground but even to read. Then the witnesses for the prosecution swear that Mr. GILLIES could not be found when they looked for him, but that he himself immediately left in the steam launch. Now it is satisfactorily proved that Mr. GILLIES first went off in a boat to the *Narcissus*, where he stayed until nearly seven o'clock, and then left in the steam launch. There is really a good deal of mystery about the occurrence. As nearly as can be ascertained, the push or kick seems to have been given about a quarter to six o'clock. The Chinese witnesses say the man died almost instantly. If so, why was not somebody informed of it, who, some ten minutes or so later, at six o'clock, the time at which the watchman at the gate was first made acquainted with the fact? The man must, if his story be true, have been lying on the ground for more than an hour without any one but these four men seeing him. This, at all events, was what the jury were asked to believe. A gunner and three other men from the *Narcissus* walked across the ground a few minutes past six o'clock and failed to see any one lying on the ground; and the gunner swore positively that it was impossible for any man to be lying there without his seeing him. Lord CHARLES SCOTT and Commander JEFFERSON gave similar testimony. They were in such a position when the vessel glided out of dock, which was directly after the event, that they could scarcely have missed observing a man lying on the ground. But no one saw him. The most obvious conclusion is that he was not there to be seen. How, then, did he die by his death? Was he, after all, in whom Mr. GILLIES pushed away

with his foot? We have nothing but the evidence of his four fellow coolies and kinsmen to prove it. Or if he was, it is not possible, as argued by the counsel for the defence, that he had another fall subsequently? In any case, there is no doubt that the blow itself did not cause death. The evidence of Mr. AYRES, as at all doubts on that head. That gentleman showed that a rupture of the spleen from a blow would be on one side only, not, as in the case of the deceased, on both sides, which could only be caused by a fall. Of course it is possible that the fall consequent on the push given by Mr. GILLIES might have caused the rupture, but that can scarcely be made to account for the bruises on the body, which are more consistent with the theory that he fell down the dock steps. Under all these circumstances, who will undertake to say that the case was clearly made out against Mr. GILLIES? It is in all of doubt, and the jury must have felt this fact deeply. In any case, had it been proved that the deceased was the man whom Mr. GILLIES pushed, and that he died in consequence of the fall, it could only have been treated as an accident, and a merely nominal punishment awarded to him. But, unfortunately, the jury could not easily reconcile the return of a verdict of manslaughter with the cloud of doubt hanging over the case. It was not right, though it was very natural, for Mr. GILLIES to use violence to the man, but he has more than sufficiently atoned for his indiscretion—an indiscretion into which he fell, out of every ten Britons would have been betrayed under similar circumstances. This verdict returned was, therefore, the only one with the conflicting evidence—that the jury could have returned consistently with a desire to do justice to the accused. It is to be regretted that the Chief Justice should, in summing up, have gone so far as to intimate that if the jury did not convict Mr. GILLIES on the evidence before them he should tremble for the cause of the administration of justice in the Colony. Such words would not have excited surprise coming from an advocate, but they were scarcely to be expected from a judge. Happily, there is good reason to believe that the Chief Justice will tremble without compunction for public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of Hongkong jurors will remain unimpaired by the verdict recorded on Saturday.

The census of the population of the Colony will be taken today.

The British steamer *Conquest* brings intelligence that the *Fort Constant* at Hong Kong reported to have set out on her voyage to Yunnan about the 20th of November.

The Agent of the Pacific Mail Company has received telegrams announcing that the steamer *Albatross*, with mails, &c., from San Francisco, to the last ultimo, sailed from Yokohama for this port on the 1st instant.

At the Peak the maximum temperature during the week ended at Saturday's close was 75.5, the minimum 55.0; at the Harbour-Master's Office, Praya Water, the maximum was 75.5, and the minimum 54.0. 0.47 inch of rain fell during the week.

DIAMANTO PERFORMANCE AT THE THEATRE ROYAL.

On Friday night the officers of H.M.S. *Tropae* gave a dramatic performance at the Theatre Royal, City Hall, in aid of the Diamond Jubilee. The play was *The Jew*, and the performance was of the highest quality. The acting was excellent, and the scenery was very fine. The audience was large, and the proceeds were well received. The play was given in aid of the Diamond Jubilee, and the proceeds were used for the benefit of the Soldiers' Dancers' Home, Hampstead.

with his foot? We have nothing but the evidence of his four fellow coolies and kinsmen to prove it. Or if he was, it is not possible, as argued by the counsel for the defence, that he had another fall subsequently? In any case, there is no doubt that the blow itself did not cause death. The evidence of Mr. AYRES, as at all doubts on that head. That gentleman showed that a rupture of the spleen from a blow would be on one side only, not, as in the case of the deceased, on both sides, which could only be caused by a fall. Of course it is possible that the fall consequent on the push given by Mr. GILLIES might have caused the rupture, but that can scarcely be made to account for the bruises on the body, which are more consistent with the theory that he fell down the dock steps. Under all these circumstances, who will undertake to say that the case was clearly made out against Mr. GILLIES? It is in all of doubt, and the jury must have felt this fact deeply. In any case, had it been proved that the deceased was the man whom Mr. GILLIES pushed, and that he died in consequence of the fall, it could only have been treated as an accident, and a merely nominal punishment awarded to him. But, unfortunately, the jury could not easily reconcile the return of a verdict of manslaughter with the cloud of doubt hanging over the case. It was not right, though it was very natural, for Mr. GILLIES to use violence to the man, but he has more than sufficiently atoned for his indiscretion—an indiscretion into which he fell, out of every ten Britons would have been betrayed under similar circumstances. This verdict returned was, therefore, the only one with the conflicting evidence—that the jury could have returned consistently with a desire to do justice to the accused. It is to be regretted that the Chief Justice should, in summing up, have gone so far as to intimate that if the jury did not convict Mr. GILLIES on the evidence before them he should tremble for the cause of the administration of justice in the Colony. Such words would not have excited surprise coming from an advocate, but they were scarcely to be expected from a judge. Happily, there is good reason to believe that the Chief Justice will tremble without compunction for public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of Hongkong jurors will remain unimpaired by the verdict recorded on Saturday.

Daily Press Office, November 13th, 1876.

NOTICE

A. S. WATSON & CO.
FAMILY AND DISPENSING
CHEMISTS.
By Appointment to His Excellency the Governor and his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh.
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DRUGGISTS,
PERFUMERS,
PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS,
DRUGGISTS' SUPPLIERS.
And
ABRATED WATER MAKERS.
SHIPS' MEDICINE CHESTS REFITTED.
PASSENGER SHIPS SUPPLIED.

NOTICE.—To avoid delay in the execution of Orders it is particularly requested that all business communications be addressed to the Firm, A. S. Watson & Co., or
827 HONGKONG DISPENSARY.

MARRIAGE.
On the 28th December, at St. John's Cathedral, Hongkong, by the Rev. R. Hayward Kidd, Colonial Chaplain, FRANCIS WALDEMAR GEORGE VON STOCKHRAUSEN, of Hongkong, to SARAH MAYNARD, only daughter of the late Lieutenant Colonel R.M.L.L. of Southern Hants.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, DECEMBER 4th, 1876.

The jury have acquitted Mr. DAVID GILLIES of the charge brought against him, and their verdict will be received with general approbation. They had to decide between the variable evidence of four Chinese witnesses on the one hand, and the positive testimony of a number of European witnesses and the dictates of common sense on the other. That there was doubt in the matter is evident to any one on reading the evidence, and it is a cardinal maxim in English law to give the accused the benefit of all doubts. Unless it was clearly proved that the man died from the effects of the push administered by Mr. GILLIES, the jury could not conscientiously bring in a verdict of manslaughter. As the Chief Justice reminded them, in summing up, reason should have supremacy over sentiment in dealing with a case of the kind. Let us see what were the statements before them, and whether they have been guided by reason or sentiment. On the 16th ultimo Mr. MARSHALL's ship, *Narcissus*, which had been undergoing repairs in the Hope Dock, Aberdeen, was being got out. Mr. GILLIES, as Secretary to the Dock Company, was there to see her safely undocked. Everything was proceeding well, but one of the masts, which passed across the ship of land between the two docks, fouled twice in consequence of some mud punts which obstructed it. Commander JEFFERSON, seeing this, called out to Mr. GILLIES, who went to the coxswain and ordered them to pull the punts away. Instead of doing this, they, probably through stupidity, pulled by the wrong barrel and made matters more critical. Mr. GILLIES, naturally excited, ran up, pushed or kicked the front coxswain, telling him to get out of the way, took the havers, threw it over the side, and told them to pull it to him. Now one of the coxswains, who was standing by, saw Mr. GILLIES strike him slightly and kicked the deceased twice when he had fallen, and that the man died on the spot. The others did not see anyone else struck, but agreed that Mr. GILLIES kicked the man twice and that he died there and then. In their evidence, however, there are numerous discrepancies. At the inquest they told one tale; at the Police Court they gave another version of the affair; and in the Supreme Court they contradicted their previous statements in some important points. At each hearing they state a different time for the occurrence, but to this discrepancy little importance can be attached. The assertion that it was nearly dark at the time was disproved by the testimony of several witnesses, who positively swore that it was quite light enough not only to see any man who might be lying on the ground but even to read. Then the witnesses for the prosecution swear that Mr. GILLIES could not be found when they looked for him, but that he himself immediately left in the steam launch. Now it is satisfactorily proved that Mr. GILLIES first went off in a boat to the *Narcissus*, where he stayed until nearly seven o'clock, and then left in the steam launch. There is really a good deal of mystery about the occurrence. As nearly as can be ascertained, the push or kick seems to have been given about a quarter to six o'clock. The Chinese witnesses say the man died almost instantly. If so, why was not somebody informed of it, who, some ten minutes or so later, at six o'clock, the time at which the watchman at the gate was first made acquainted with the fact? The man must, if his story be true, have been lying on the ground for more than an hour without any one but these four men seeing him. This, at all events, was what the jury were asked to believe. A gunner and three other men from the *Narcissus* walked across the ground a few minutes past six o'clock and failed to see any one lying on the ground; and the gunner swore positively that it was impossible for any man to be lying there without his seeing him. Lord CHARLES SCOTT and Commander JEFFERSON gave similar testimony. They were in such a position when the vessel glided out of dock, which was directly after the event, that they could scarcely have missed observing a man lying on the ground. But no one saw him. The most obvious conclusion is that he was not there to be seen. How, then, did he die by his death? Was he, after all, in whom Mr. GILLIES pushed away

with his foot? We have nothing but the evidence of his four fellow coolies and kinsmen to prove it. Or if he was, it is not possible, as argued by the counsel for the defence, that he had another fall subsequently? In any case, there is no doubt that the blow itself did not cause death. The evidence of Mr. AYRES, as at all doubts on that head. That gentleman showed that a rupture of the spleen from a blow would be on one side only, not, as in the case of the deceased, on both sides, which could only be caused by a fall. Of course it is possible that the fall consequent on the push given by Mr. GILLIES might have caused the rupture, but that can scarcely be made to account for the bruises on the body, which are more consistent with the theory that he fell down the dock steps. Under all these circumstances, who will undertake to say that the case was clearly made out against Mr. GILLIES? It is in all of doubt, and the jury must have felt this fact deeply. In any case, had it been proved that the deceased was the man whom Mr. GILLIES pushed, and that he died in consequence of the fall, it could only have been treated as an accident, and a merely nominal punishment awarded to him. But, unfortunately, the jury could not easily reconcile the return of a verdict of manslaughter with the cloud of doubt hanging over the case. It was not right, though it was very natural, for Mr. GILLIES to use violence to the man, but he has more than sufficiently atoned for his indiscretion—an indiscretion into which he fell, out of every ten Britons would have been betrayed under similar circumstances. This verdict returned was, therefore, the only one with the conflicting evidence—that the jury could have returned consistently with a desire to do justice to the accused. It is to be regretted that the Chief Justice should, in summing up, have gone so far as to intimate that if the jury did not convict Mr. GILLIES on the evidence before them he should tremble for the cause of the administration of justice in the Colony. Such words would not have excited surprise coming from an advocate, but they were scarcely to be expected from a judge. Happily, there is good reason to believe that the Chief Justice will tremble without compunction for public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of Hongkong jurors will remain unimpaired by the verdict recorded on Saturday.

The census of the population of the Colony will be taken today.

The British steamer *Conquest* brings intelligence that the *Fort Constant* at Hong Kong reported to have set out on her voyage to Yunnan about the 20th of November.

The Agent of the Pacific Mail Company has received telegrams announcing that the steamer *Albatross*, with mails, &c., from San Francisco, to the last ultimo, sailed from Yokohama for this port on the 1st instant.

At the Peak the maximum temperature during the week ended at Saturday's close was 75.5, the minimum 55.0; at the Harbour-Master's Office, Praya Water, the maximum was 75.5, and the minimum 54.0. 0.47 inch of rain fell during the week.

DIAMANTO PERFORMANCE AT THE THEATRE ROYAL.

On Friday night the officers of H.M.S. *Tropae* gave a dramatic performance at the Theatre Royal, City Hall, in aid of the Diamond Jubilee. The play was *The Jew*, and the performance was of the highest quality. The acting was excellent, and the scenery was very fine. The audience was large, and the proceeds were well received. The play was given in aid of the Diamond Jubilee, and the proceeds were used for the benefit of the Soldiers' Dancers' Home, Hampstead.

with his foot? We have nothing but the evidence of his four fellow coolies and kinsmen to prove it. Or if he was, it is not possible, as argued by the counsel for the defence, that he had another fall subsequently? In any case, there is no doubt that the blow itself did not cause death. The evidence of Mr. AYRES, as at all doubts on that head. That gentleman showed that a rupture of the spleen from a blow would be on one side only, not, as in the case of the deceased, on both sides, which could only be caused by a fall. Of course it is possible that the fall consequent on the push given by Mr. GILLIES might have caused the rupture, but that can scarcely be made to account for the bruises on the body, which are more consistent with the theory that he fell down the dock steps. Under all these circumstances, who will undertake to say that the case was clearly made out against Mr. GILLIES? It is in all of doubt, and the jury must have felt this fact deeply. In any case, had it been proved that the deceased was the man whom Mr. GILLIES pushed, and that he died in consequence of the fall, it could only have been treated as an accident, and a merely nominal punishment awarded to him. But, unfortunately, the jury could not easily reconcile the return of a verdict of manslaughter with the cloud of doubt hanging over the case. It was not right, though it was very natural, for Mr. GILLIES to use violence to the man, but he has more than sufficiently atoned for his indiscretion—an indiscretion into which he fell, out of every ten Britons would have been betrayed under similar circumstances. This verdict returned was, therefore, the only one with the conflicting evidence—that the jury could have returned consistently with a desire to do justice to the accused. It is to be regretted that the Chief Justice should, in summing up, have gone so far as to intimate that if the jury did not convict Mr. GILLIES on the evidence before them he should tremble for the cause of the administration of justice in the Colony. Such words would not have excited surprise coming from an advocate, but they were scarcely to be expected from a judge. Happily, there is good reason to believe that the Chief Justice will tremble without compunction for public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of Hongkong jurors will remain unimpaired by the verdict recorded on Saturday.

Daily Press Office, November 13th, 1876.

NOTICE

A. S. WATSON & CO.
FAMILY AND DISPENSING
CHEMISTS.
By Appointment to His Excellency the Governor and his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh.
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DRUGGISTS,
PERFUMERS,
PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS,
DRUGGISTS' SUPPLIERS.
And
ABRATED WATER MAKERS.
SHIPS' MEDICINE CHESTS REFITTED.
PASSENGER SHIPS SUPPLIED.

NOTICE.—To avoid delay in the execution of Orders it is particularly requested that all business communications be addressed to the Firm, A. S. Watson & Co., or
827 HONGKONG DISPENSARY.

MARRIAGE.
On the 28th December, at St. John's Cathedral, Hongkong, by the Rev. R. Hayward Kidd, Colonial Chaplain, FRANCIS WALDEMAR GEORGE VON STOCKHRAUSEN, of Hongkong, to SARAH MAYNARD, only daughter of the late Lieutenant Colonel R.M.L.L. of Southern Hants.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, DECEMBER 4th, 1876.

The jury have acquitted Mr. DAVID GILLIES of the charge brought against him, and their verdict will be received with general approbation. They had to decide between the variable evidence of four Chinese witnesses on the one hand, and the positive testimony of a number of European witnesses and the dictates of common sense on the other. That there was doubt in the matter is evident to any one on reading the evidence, and it is a cardinal maxim in English law to give the accused the benefit of all doubts. Unless it was clearly proved that the man died from the effects of the push administered by Mr. GILLIES, the jury could not conscientiously bring in a verdict of manslaughter. As the Chief Justice reminded them, in summing up, reason should have supremacy over sentiment in dealing with a case of the kind. Let us see what were the statements before them, and whether they have been guided by reason or sentiment. On the 16th ultimo Mr. MARSHALL's ship, *Narcissus*, which had been undergoing repairs in the Hope Dock, Aberdeen, was being got out. Mr. GILLIES, as Secretary to the Dock Company, was there to see her safely undocked. Everything was proceeding well, but one of the masts, which passed across the ship of land between the two docks, fouled twice in consequence of some mud punts which obstructed it. Commander JEFFERSON, seeing this, called out to Mr. GILLIES, who went to the coxswain and ordered them to pull the punts away. Instead of doing this, they, probably through stupidity, pulled by the wrong barrel and made matters more critical. Mr. GILLIES, naturally excited, ran up, pushed or kicked the front coxswain, telling him to get out of the way, took the havers, threw it over the side, and told them to pull it to him. Now one of the coxswains, who was standing by, saw Mr. GILLIES strike him slightly and kicked the deceased twice when he had fallen, and that the man died on the spot. The others did not see anyone else struck, but agreed that Mr. GILLIES kicked the man twice and that he died there and then. In their evidence, however, there are numerous discrepancies. At the inquest they told one tale; at the Police Court they gave another version of the affair; and in the Supreme Court they contradicted their previous statements in some important points. At each hearing they state a different time for the occurrence, but to this discrepancy little importance can be attached. The assertion that it was nearly dark at the time was disproved by the testimony of several witnesses, who positively swore that it was quite light enough not only to see any man who might be lying on the ground but even to read. Then the witnesses for the prosecution swear that Mr. GILLIES could not be found when they looked for him, but that he himself immediately left in the steam launch. Now it is satisfactorily proved that Mr. GILLIES first went off in a boat to the *Narcissus*, where he stayed until nearly seven o'clock, and then left in the steam launch. There is really a good deal of mystery about the occurrence. As nearly as can be ascertained, the push or kick seems to have been given about a quarter to six o'clock. The Chinese witnesses say the man died almost instantly. If so, why was not somebody informed of it, who, some ten minutes or so later, at six o'clock, the time at which the watchman at the gate was first made acquainted with the fact? The man must, if his story be true, have been lying on the ground for more than an hour without any one but these four men seeing him. This, at all events, was what the jury were asked to believe. A gunner and three other men from the *Narcissus* walked across the ground a few minutes past six o'clock and failed to see any one lying on the ground; and the gunner swore positively that it was impossible for any man to be lying there without his seeing him. Lord CHARLES SCOTT and Commander JEFFERSON gave similar testimony. They were in such a position when the vessel glided out of dock, which was directly after the event, that they could scarcely have missed observing a man lying on the ground. But no one saw him. The most obvious conclusion is that he was not there to be seen. How, then, did he die by his death? Was he, after all, in whom Mr. GILLIES pushed away

with his foot? We have nothing but the evidence of his four fellow coolies and kinsmen to prove it. Or if he was, it is not possible, as argued by the counsel for the defence, that he had another fall subsequently? In any case, there is no doubt that the blow itself did not cause death. The evidence of Mr. AYRES, as at all doubts on that head. That gentleman showed that a rupture of the spleen from a blow would be on one side only, not, as in the case of the deceased, on both sides, which could only be caused by a fall. Of course it is possible that the fall consequent on the push given by Mr. GILLIES might have caused the rupture, but that can scarcely be made to account for the bruises on the body, which are more consistent with the theory that he fell down the dock steps. Under all these circumstances, who will undertake to say that the case was clearly made out against Mr. GILLIES? It is in all of doubt, and the jury must have felt this fact deeply. In any case, had it been proved that the deceased was the man whom Mr. GILLIES pushed, and that he died in consequence of the fall, it could only have been treated as an accident, and a merely nominal punishment awarded to him. But, unfortunately, the jury could not easily reconcile the return of a verdict of manslaughter with the cloud of doubt hanging over the case. It was not right, though it was very natural, for Mr. GILLIES to use violence to the man, but he has more than sufficiently atoned for his indiscretion—an indiscretion into which he fell, out of every ten Britons would have been betrayed under similar circumstances. This verdict returned was, therefore, the only one with the conflicting evidence—that the jury could have returned consistently with a desire to do justice to the accused. It is to be regretted that the Chief Justice should, in summing up, have gone so far as to intimate that if the jury did not convict Mr. GILLIES on the evidence before them he should tremble for the cause of the administration of justice in the Colony. Such words would not have excited surprise coming from an advocate, but they were scarcely to be expected from a judge. Happily, there is good reason to believe that the Chief Justice will tremble without compunction for public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of Hongkong jurors will remain unimpaired by the verdict recorded on Saturday.

The census of the population of the Colony will be taken today.

The British steamer *Conquest* brings intelligence that the *Fort Constant* at Hong Kong reported to have set out on her voyage to Yunnan about the 20th of November.

The Agent of the Pacific Mail Company has received telegrams announcing that the steamer *Albatross*, with mails, &c., from San Francisco, to the last ultimo, sailed from Yokohama for this port on the 1st instant.

At the Peak the maximum temperature during the week ended at Saturday's close was 75.5, the minimum 55.0; at the Harbour-Master's Office, Praya Water, the maximum was 75.5, and the minimum 54.0. 0.47 inch of rain fell during the week.

DIAMANTO PERFORMANCE AT THE THEATRE ROYAL.

On Friday night the officers of H.M.S. *Tropae* gave a dramatic

| | | |
|-----------|------|------|
| per pound | 0.17 | 6.25 |
| " | 2.28 | 2.80 |
| " | 2.21 | 2.45 |

8
0
6
0
0
0
0
50
50
50
50
55
55
71
10
71
71
16
40
70
70
20

75
00
00
00
50
20
50
00
30
75
05
50
00
00
45
00
50
50
05

0.30
 0.20
 1.75
 1.05
 1.75
 2.50
 2.40
 9.65
 8.80

mp

nel
nne
kok
apore
apore
on

ork
piece
ool
ates

0
5
0
6
8
0
6
0
00
00
50
25
45
71
40
31
74
35
40
70
70
20

75
00
00
00
50
20
50
00
30
75
05
50
00
00
45
00
50
50
05

0.30
 0.20
 1.75
 1.05
 1.75
 2.50
 2.40
 9.65
 8.80

mp

on
pore
ng
pore

nel
nne
kok
apore
apore
on

Figure 1 shows a schematic of a 2D lattice of particles. The lattice is divided into two horizontal sections, labeled 'A' (top) and 'B' (bottom). Particles are represented by small circles. A vertical line separates the two sections. To the right, a vertical axis labeled 'z' indicates the direction of the external field. A horizontal line is drawn at a certain height, and a vertical line segment is labeled 'h'.

10

ghai
lies

1990

York

School

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|----------|------|---------------------|--------------|
| Annabine | Oct. 27 | Amr. sh | 1238 | Peck, Hubbard & Co | New York |
| Antelope | Aug. 13 | Bril. sh | 384 | Peck, Hubbard & Co | |
| Bastion | Aug. 13 | Bril. sh | 750 | Peck, Hubbard & Co | |
| Chalouge | Nov. 16 | Span. bk | 21 | Peck, Hubbard & Co | |
| Chumbe | Nov. 3 | Bril. bk | 253 | Oni Germania | |
| Cumbria | Feb. 7 | Span. bk | 440 | Oni Loro | S. Francisco |
| Danmark | Oct. 10 | Bril. sh | 915 | Peck, Hubbard & Co | |
| D. Nicholson | Oct. 14 | Bril. sh | 504 | Smith, Ball & Co | Liverpool |
| G. F. Mante | Oct. 18 | From. bk | 625 | Peck, Hubbard & Co | U. States |
| Hudsonford | Nov. 2 | Nor. bk | 677 | Kee & Co | |
| Indiana | July 7 | Span. bk | 574 | Griggs & Livingston | |
| John Bayan | Sept. 24 | Amr. bk | 681 | Kear & Co | |
| M. O. Puchazo | Sept. 3 | Span. bk | 371 | Alfonso & Co | |
| M. Labanon | Oct. 5 | Bril. bk | 530 | C. Lutz & Co | |
| Roscoe | Oct. 19 | Bril. bk | 5038 | Toddman & Co | |
| S. S. of the West | Aug. 28 | Amr. sh | 1,81 | Peck, Hubbard & Co | |
| T. S. S. Family | Aug. 28 | Bril. sh | 1050 | Hermand & Co | London |
| Unidad | Oct. 11 | Span. bk | 441 | Earlham & Co | |
| Vizcaya | Oct. 27 | Span. bk | 479 | Alfonso & Co | |

Printed and Published by WILLIAM H. SMITH, 479 Madison Street, Hongkong.